

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested. Claims 20-39 are pending, Claims 20, 23 and 39 having been amended by way of the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 20-22 and 39 were rejected as being anticipated by Madsen (U.S. Patent No. 3,932,779); Claims 23-28 were rejected as being anticipated by Wood (UK 1,135,242); Claims 29, 31-32, 34 and 38 were rejected as being unpatentable over Wood in view of Elton (U.S. Patent No. 4,853,565); Claim 30 was rejected as being unpatentable over Wood, Elton, and in further view of Shildneck (U.S. Patent No. 3,014,139); and Claims 33 and 35-37 were rejected as being unpatentable over Wood in view of Elton and in view of Elton et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,622,116, hereinafter Elton et al.).

In reply, independent Claim 20 has been amended to clarify the feature that the present invention includes a “substituting” step, where a cold pressure medium is substituted for a hot pressure medium in the tube inserted into the rotating electric machine. Moreover, Claim 20 has been amended to expressly state that the cold pressure medium is a different medium than the hot pressure medium. This does not mean that the cold pressure medium and the hot pressure medium need to be two different substances (e.g., one being oil and the other being water), but rather two different physical objects, one being cold and the other being hot (e.g., perhaps hot water is substituted with cold water).

Madsen is directed to a device in which a pressure tube 5 is injected with plastic liquid. Moreover, this liquid may be a room temperature curing resin, or thermosetting resin (e.g., column 2, lines 35-38, and column 3, lines 24-26). However, once the resin is inserted, a portion of the filling tube 8 is heated so as to create a hardened plug to thereby prevent further material from entering or exiting from the pressure tubes 5. The material in the pressure tube then hardens.

The outstanding Office Action asserts that Madsen discloses the invention defined by Claim 20, in that the pressure tubes are first supplied with a hot pressure medium and “after the resin in the pressure medium has hardened thus formed a ‘cold pressure medium’ such that tubes 5 solidify and permanently assume expanded shape” (Office Action, last lines of page 2 and beginning of page 3).

However, original Claim 20 required substituting a cold pressure medium for a hot pressure medium. Apparently the outstanding Office Action concluded that this claim would cover a situation where the hot pressure medium is the same material as the cold pressure medium, after it has cooled off. The amendment to Claim 20 distinguishes such a feature, requiring that the cold pressure medium be a different medium than the hot pressure medium. It is respectfully submitted that Madsen neither teaches nor suggests the substituting step (as amended) of Claim 20 and therefore it does not anticipate Claim 20, or Claims 21 and 22 which depend therefrom. Claim 39 has been similarly amended to Claim 20 and therefore it is believed that Claim 39 also patentably defines over Madsen.

Claim 23 is directed to a rotating electric machine, that includes a stator having an undulating side and a flat side. The rotating electric machine also includes an insulated cable having a substantially round-cross-section (added by way of the present Amendment) configured to be received into concave portions of the undulated side of the stator slots. Claim 23 has further been amended to clarify that the concave portions have a rounded cross-section portion that substantially matches a corresponding outer portion of the insulated cable. Support for the present amendment is found in Figure 4 as an example and thus no new matter is added.

The outstanding Office Action asserts that Wood discloses all the features of Claim 23. Wood however, as seen in Figure 5 thereof, does not include cables with round cross-sections, but includes conventional winding bars, having substantially rectangular cross-

sections. Claim 23 has been amended to distinguish conventional winding bar structures by specifying that the stator cable windings are insulated cables having a substantially round cross-section. Furthermore, Claim 23 has been amended to clarify that the concave portions have a rounded cross-section portion that substantially matches a corresponding outer portion of the insulating cable.

Comparing amended Claim 23 to Wood, it is clear that Wood neither teaches nor suggests a stator cable winding, or a stator having concave portions with a rounded cross-section portion that substantially matches a corresponding outer portion of the insulated cable. Rather, Wood relies on a much more complicated wedge type structure 7, as shown in the figures thereof so that the rectangular cross-shaped winding bars, may be properly housed within the slots of the conventional device of Wood. Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that based on the above discussion, it should be clear that Claim 23 is not anticipated by Wood. Because Claims 24-28 depend from Claim 23 it is respectfully submitted that these claims also patentably define over Wood.

Each of the other dependent claims, namely 29, 31-32, 34, 38, 33 and 35-37, are all based on the Office Action's analysis of Wood, in view of secondary and tertiary references addressed to each of specific features in the dependent claims. However, it is respectfully submitted that none of the asserted references teach or suggest the features discussed above which are also absent in Wood. Accordingly, no matter how Wood is combined with the secondary and tertiary references asserted in the outstanding Office Action, the combination would not teach or suggest all the elements of these dependent claims. Thus it is believed that these dependent claims also patentably define over any combination of the asserted prior art.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 20-39, as

amended, is patentably distinguishing over the prior art. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of this application is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000

Fax: (703) 413 -2220

(OSMMN 08/03)

BDL:smi

I:\ATTY\BDL\9847\98470049-AM.DOC